University of Chicago

Department of Sociology

“Comply or Goodbye”: A Comparative Case Study Exploring How Two Different Communities in Chicago Mobilized Against General Iron

by

Laura Sandino

Undergraduate Thesis

Spring 2023

Preceptor: Moira O’Shea

Faculty Advisor: René D. Flores

Abstract

This paper conducts a sociological case study into the movements created in response to General Iron's relocation from the affluent, predominantly white neighborhood of Lincoln Park in Chicago's North Side to the low-income Black and Latinx neighborhood of the Southeast Side of Chicago. Through in-depth interviews conducted with residents and organizers from both of these communities, I find that while Lincoln Park used a NIMBY (Not-In-My-Back-Yard) framing to push General Iron out of their area, the Southeast Side created the Stop General Iron movement and used environmental justice (EJ) framing to successfully prevent the company from relocating into their community. While both of these movements succeeded in their goals, I find that Stop General Iron had to resort to more radical mobilization strategies, such as protests and a 30-day hunger strike, than Lincoln Parkers. I argue that this is due to the City of Chicago's discriminatory treatment of the South Side of Chicago, and because of historically racist zoning laws that have reproduced these environmental injustices in the Southeast Side and kept the area as an industrial dumping ground.

INTRODUCTION

How do race and class influence social movement mobilization strategies? On April 8th, 2023 I was given a private "Toxic Wastes" tour of the Southeast Side of Chicago. Maria, a born and raised Southeast Sider who works in one of the environmental justice task forces in the neighborhood, offered to give me a tour after we spoke on Zoom for over an hour about her experiences doing environmental justice (EJ) organizing to protect her community from polluting companies threatening to move in. Maria's interview was one of the first I conducted with organizers on the Southeast Side in an effort to answer the question of how race and class affect social movement mobilization strategies. Maria's participation within the Stop General Iron movement would help me answer this question. Stop General Iron, an EJ movement started by Southeast Side residents, activists, students and workers, took on the task of defending the 10th ward, a residential area located within the Calumet Industrial Corridor, the largest industrial corridor in Chicago.

The movement started in 2019 when General Iron, a scrap steel recycling plant which was located in the North Side of Chicago for over 20 years, was shut down and began plans to relocate into the Southeast Side of Chicago. These plans for relocating an infamous polluting facility from the affluent, predominantly white neighborhood of Lincoln Park in the North Side of Chicago to the working class, mostly Black and Latinx neighborhood of the Southeast Side started an uproar from residents in the 10th ward who found this relocation to be a blatant issue of environmental racism, defined as "...the disproportionate impact of environmental hazards on people of color," (Greenaction 2018). In this paper I ask how the communities of the SouthEast

Side and Lincoln Park, with their different socioeconomic and racial makeup, have framed movements and used different strategies to mobilize against the General Iron Industries recycling plant either invading or residing in their neighborhood, respectively.

On my tour, Maria defined this relocation as the "most obvious example of environmental racism that we have seen in recent years in the city of Chicago." Maria, a 40-something Mexican-American woman who has been living in the 10th ward her whole life, and is now a single mother raising her daughter in this neighborhood, spoke these powerful words to me as we drove around the neighborhood she calls home. Maria took me to several spots in the Southeast Side that hold environmental justice significance, from bright yellow sulfur piles located by the Calumet River to Big Marsh, a 297-acre park and green space with diverse flora and fauna growing despite high amounts of "slag", a by-product of smelting ores that came from the local chemical plants found in the area. The most striking part of this tour was when Maria drove me to the local high school, George Washington High School, pointing right across the street to a huge lot of land packed with large, shipping-sized containers and diesel trucks coming in and out: "That's the General Iron site," Maria revealed to me. I was in shock.

After around two years of intense, radical organizing by Stop General Iron and other EJ organizations around Chicago, the permit for the building of the General Iron site in the Southeast Side was finally denied. It took radical tactics such as protests outside of Mayor Lori Lightfoot's house, as well as a 30-day hunger strike in order for the city to deny the permit. However, the company that owns General Iron, Reserve Management Group, is continuously pushing back on the denial of the permit, claiming that the city gave them permission to start building their facility in the 10th ward before the permit was denied. Maria slyly told me that the

blue containers lining the site were strategically placed there so that people couldn't look inside at what was being built, but she claimed that there was an entire site already built and they were just waiting to sue the city and get the permit back so that they could open it.

The most shocking sight, however, was not the site itself, but the fact that it was located right across from the local high school. Environmental justice is defined by many scholars as being able to "live, work and play," (Novotny 2000) in safe and healthy environments that aren't affected by disproportionate industrial waste and pollution. The juxtaposition of the General Iron site in front of the local high school reminded me of an interview I conducted with Lorena, a school teacher at this high school, who was also a part of the Stop General Iron movement. Lorena told me that she initially joined the movement in order to protect her students' health so that they would be able to get a fair and just education. Under the "live, work, play" framework, it is clear that the Stop General Iron movement falls under the definition of environmental justice as it establishes that residents of the Southeast Side of Chicago should have equal opportunities to live, work and play in safe environments as residents in Lincoln Park, and the entire city of Chicago.

Although I did not get the chance to visit the site where General Iron used to operate in Lincoln Park, which presents a limitation to my research, I was able to garner residents' experiences having lived in the same neighborhood as this plant for many years. Even though my results differed among Lincoln Parkers, an overwhelming majority of residents actively opposed General Iron. However, the way that this opposition manifested itself into direct action differed from Stop General Iron's tactics in many ways. Specifically, these two neighborhoods engaged in oppositional framing tactics, therefore leading to different mobilization strategies. Snow et al.

borrow from Goffman's (1974) concept of "framing," stating that it is used "to denote 'schemata of interpretation' that enable individuals 'to locate, perceive, identify, and label' occurrences within their life space and the world at large." (Snow at al 1986, 464). On the one hand, Stop General Iron's framing leverages EJ and takes advantage of having an established, strong network of organizations with experience in organizing against EJ issues. On the other hand, North Siders took on a NIMBY (Not-In-My-Backyard) framing and were able to leverage their power and connections to the government in order to get the plant out of their neighborhood.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In order to answer the theoretical question of how race and class influence social movement mobilization strategies, I leverage two bodies of research: political process theory and resource mobilization theory. When looking at my empirical question regarding the different framing and organizing strategies of Lincoln Park and the Southeast Side against General Iron, we must also take into consideration how EJ movements fit into these frameworks. Firstly, political process theory addresses the way that social movements emerge in response to perceived grievances, and are mobilized by individuals and organizations to engage in collective action. Political process theory takes on a view that focuses heavily on achieving change within existing political structures, viewing formal political processes like voting and lobbying as the mechanisms for social change. Environmental justice movements, on the other hand, are found to rely on more informal methods, such as grassroots organizing and direct action that push for changes in the existing social structures, and don't necessarily fit neatly into the political process model. As Bullard states in *Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World*, "In many

instances, grassroots leaders emerged from groups of concerned citizens [...] who see their families, homes, and communities threatened by some type of polluting industry or government policy," (Bullard 2003, 8).

Resource mobilization theory, on the other hand, can be used to address the way environmental justice movements are able to mobilize their resources to achieve their goals by accessing and utilizing resources effectively. According to resource mobilization, social movements will not be successful if they are unable to access resources and mobilize them efficiently. However, EJ movements may serve as an example of successful organizing without neatly fitting into the resource mobilization model.

As shown by Bullard, as well as other environmental justice authors I will discuss further, sentiments of grassroots organizing in response to environmental dangers prevail. Therefore, in the following sections I critique the limitations of the political process and research mobilization theories in addressing EJ movements, and will also provide literature on existing theories on EJ movements.

LIMITATIONS OF POLITICAL PROCESS THEORY

In this section, I will be reviewing the political process theory and its limitations when applied to environmental justice movements. First off, I will provide an overview of the theory, including influential authors and literature that helped establish it. Next, I will be addressing the gaps in the political process theory literature, including its overemphasis on political opportunities and its lack of consideration for minority groups who are often left out of the political process. I will then look at why EJ movements do not fit neatly within this model by examining how these movements aim at restructuring the political process.

Starting off, political process theory emerged in the 1960s and 70s responding to limitations in earlier social movement theories. These earlier theories focused on collective action, and the psychological and individual factors that led to participation in collective action (Brockman 2019). Proponents of the political process theory, such as McAdam in his 1982 book *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency*, used this mechanism as an alternative to theories on collective behavior, as well as the emerging resource mobilization theory. McAdam defines the political process model as a

> model of social movement development [that] asserts that the emergence of protest activity is a function of political opportunities and constraints. Opportunities and constraints, in turn, are themselves products of the political institutional structure. Social movements, in this view, are the collective response of a group of people to structural changes in the political system that affect their chances of achieving their objectives. (1982, 969)

What the political process model, with its emphasis on social movement success relative to how those in power receive it (McAdam 1982, 36-37), fails to address are the mobilization needs of social movements that focus on systemic change to the existing social and political structures, such as EJ movements. As Bullard states, “Only through fundamental restructuring of the political and economic system can we hope to protect the health and welfare of all Americans and prevent the discriminatory dumping of hazardous wastes on any community” (Bullard 1990, 143). According to Bullard, EJ movements represent “a challenge to the systems of power and privilege that perpetuate environmental injustice,” and are “focused on organizing and advocating for policies and practices that promote fairness, equity, and sustainability,” while also “[seeking] to empower marginalized communities to take control of their own environmental destinies and to challenge the status quo in pursuit of a more just and sustainable future,”

(Bullard 1990, 7). Therefore, in order to succeed, EJ movements must "challenge the status quo," something that political process theory does not account for.

The political process model seeks to understand how movements can effectively use the existing political process to achieve their goals, whether that means maintaining the status quo or bringing about fundamental change. While a lot of environmental justice movements may be focused on the state as their main opponent, there are many movements which are aimed at specific industries and companies, which are not represented by political process model, as Goodwin and Jasper find this framework to exclude "any movements that do not target the state as their main opponent," (Goodwin and Jasper 1999, 34). When juxtaposing this model to Bullard's view of EJ movements as being "challenge[s] to the systems of power and privilege," (Bullard 1990, 7) as well as challenging the unequal distribution of industrial operations produced by the system, it is clear that political process theory does not seek to understand how EJ movements mobilize outside of the scope of political opportunities.

While the political process model can actually be used to understand some aspects of environmental justice movements, such as the framing processes used by these groups in order to appeal to local and national governments to achieve change (Capek 1993, 1), it once again looks at this through the lens of political opportunities, failing to recognize other non-political opportunities that emerge in the social fabric that provide the chance for a social movement to be successful. Contemporary examples of such opportunities can be caused by phenomena such as the coronavirus pandemic, which articles such as Pleyers (2020) argue allowed for social movements to be "particularly active during this challenging period" (Pleyers 2020, 1). Specifically, environmental justice movements have been able to use the COVID-19 pandemic in

order to gain traction for their framing and goals: “The COVID-19 pandemic has coincided with a powerful upsurge in antiracist activism in the United States, linking many forms and consequences of racism to public and environmental health,” (Powers 2021, 222). EJ movements that emerged during the pandemic, such as the Stop General Iron movement, framed COVID-19 as an environmental justice and health justice issue, engaging with the pandemic in a subversive way and showing how non-political opportunities can be leveraged in order to achieve their goals of restructuring unequal systems of power (Powers 2021).

Another limitation of political process theory is that it argues that citizen participation can help ensure that policy decisions are made in the public interest. However, the “public interest” is not in the favor of minority low-income communities who are most often left out of the political process. Goodwin (1999) suggests that political process theory often downplays the role of power in shaping political outcomes, which can obscure the ways in which marginalized groups are excluded from the political process. In accordance with Goodwin, Robert Figueroa (2003) addresses this limitation in the political process model by arguing for participatory justice to restructure the political process in order to center the voices of minority communities who are left out of the existing political structure. Participatory justice is needed to center the voices of minority communities in Chicago and restructure Chicago’s zoning laws to get rid of the disproportionate environmental burden that these communities face. By making sure that vulnerable communities, such as the Southeast Side, are able to be involved in the decision-making processes that affect them, participatory justice can help address power imbalances that contribute to the links between poverty, discrimination, and environmental injustice. The Stop General Iron movement advocates for a participatory justice approach in its framing strategies.

While Figueroa's (2003) and Goodwin's (1999) frameworks bring us closer to understanding the formation of environmental justice movements, more literature is needed to answer my research question. For this reason, I chose to also analyze resource mobilization theory to seek another perspective on these issues which looks more closely into relevant factors such as class, racial and cultural aspects that are not considered by the political process model.

LIMITATIONS OF RESOURCE MOBILIZATION THEORY

In this section, I will similarly start off by summarizing the characteristics of resource mobilization theory and how it may be useful in analyzing the relationships between class, ethnicity and EJ movement formation. However, I will also address gaps in the resource mobilization literature as well as its limitations to consider grievance-based models of EJ movement formation and how minority groups affected by environmental injustices may mobilize resources in different ways in order to achieve their goals. Finally, I will touch on debates concerning the effects of NIMBYism in affluent communities on EJ movements in low-income communities, and relate these to the resource mobilization model.

Starting off, resource mobilization theory is defined by McCarthy and Zald as "[emphasizing] both societal support and constraint of social movement phenomena. It examines the variety of resources that must be mobilized, the linkages of social movements to other groups, the dependence of movements upon external support for success, and the tactics used by authorities to control or incorporate movements" (McCarthy and Zald 1977, 1213). After emerging in the 1970s as response to previous social movement theories such as Gurr (1970), Turner and Killian (1972), and Smelser (1963) that emphasized the need for pre-existing grievances in order for social movements to be created, resource mobilization theory "[doubts]

the assumption of a close link between preexisting discontent and generalized beliefs in the rise of social movement phenomena." (McCarthy and Zald 1977, 1214). In contrast to the political process model where political opportunities, framing and mobilization structures are considered to be the most important determinants to social movement success, Jenkins argues that in resource mobilization theory, "group organization is argued to be the major determinant of mobilization potential and patterns" (Jenkins 1983, 527). While focusing on group organization seems more relevant to EJ movements, since, as established earlier by Bullard (1990), EJ movements organize themselves accordingly against the social structures they are trying to disassemble, the argument that grievances are not necessarily a part of social movements, and therefore, EJ movements, is incorrect.

Contrasting this framework, Brulle and Pellow (2005) establish the social production of environmental inequality as the root of EJ movement formation. To do this, they argue that EJ movements emerge from the disproportionate environmental burdens that different social groups experience. Both race and class are important within this framework, as they identify that low-income and minority communities are the most affected groups overburdened by industrial and environmental waste. The overburdening of these communities is not an accident, however, but is caused intentionally through zoning laws and discriminatory policies. Therefore, EJ movements, according to Brulle and Pellow (2005), are formed by affected and vulnerable groups out of necessity and concern for their health and communities as a way of fighting systemic environmental injustices, and so, follow the model of grievance-based movements. Additionally, Bullard (1990) establishes EJ movement formation as a response to systemic patterns of environmental injustice when it comes to disproportionately located toxic waste sites

in low-income communities and communities of color. While Bullard adopts aspects of resource mobilization theory such as the importance of organizational resources and collective action, he further emphasizes the importance of grassroots organizing and collective identity, which is lacking from the previous framework, as he notes that EJ movements are usually led and grounded in the experiences and perspectives of the affected communities themselves as a response to systemic environmental injustices. These authors directly oppose McCarthy and Zald's argument that "Social movements may or may not be based upon the grievances of the presumed beneficiaries," (1977, 1216).

Resource mobilization centers on how groups are able to access and mobilize resources in order to achieve their goals, making it clear that groups with more access to resources such as funding, political power and networks are most likely to be successful. However, previous studies on EJ movements show that groups fighting to defend their community against environmental dangers are often disenfranchised, (Jenkins 1983, Pellow 2003 & 2005, Bullard 1990, Rios 2005) and therefore lacking access to funding and political power. Without funding and resources, EJ groups are predicted to be unsuccessful by resource mobilization theory. However, Pellow (2005) in his book *Garbage Wars,* argues that disenfranchised groups are able to mobilize for environmental justice by building strong networks and alliances with other organizations by coming together to draw on their collective power and resources. An aspect that is missing from resource mobilization theory, EJ movements are able to succeed by building broad-based coalitions bringing together stakeholders, community residents, and other environmental organizations. In addition, most low-income and communities of color that experience environmental injustices in the United States often are zoned into industrial areas

(Bullard 1990) and therefore experience repeated patterns of systemic environmental degradation, enabling networks in these communities to establish efficient mobilizing strategies to repeatedly defend their communities. It is therefore assumed that, although more affluent, predominantly white communities may historically have more governmental protections and trust in their representatives (Pérez 2008, Kahan 2007, Frumkin 2002), as well as more resources and power to fight against environmental dangers (Bullard 1990, Pellow 2005), because of this they may be more ill-prepared to fight against environmental dangers due to ignorance and inexperience when it comes to mobilizing against these issues.

So far, this section has touched upon the origins of resource mobilization theory, and several limitations when it comes to addressing how EJ movements form and mobilize. These limitations include the assumption that not all social movements of this nature form in response to perceived grievances, as well as how most EJ organizations are often formed by, and to protect, disenfranchised groups who may not be able to access funding and resources required for a social movement to succeed. However, these organizations may succeed through their connections and pre-existing activist networks. This is due to the fact that most of these movements emerge in neighborhoods that must repeatedly deal with infringements to their rights to environmental justice. This brings us to the final topic of discussion under resource mobilization, where I will be analyzing how NIMBYism fits into this framework.

While I've talked about how Bullard's views on EJ movement formation and organization disagree with resource mobilization theory, there is another body of literature that clashes with Bullard's theory when it comes to the origins of EJ social movement formation, but fits within the resource mobilization framework. While Bullard completely opposes NIMBYism

and views it as a process that "...works to the disadvantage of poor minority communities," (Bullard 1990), since "Affluent communities oppose the siting of hazardous facilities in their local community but favor siting them someplace else in their state," (Bullard 1990, 594), McGurty (1997) presents a different view on NIMBYism. McGurty argues that NIMBYism, a movement strongly associated with affluent communities opposing unwanted land use, evolves into environmental justice movements through the recognition by these affluent communities that marginalized communities are disproportionately affected by environmental hazards. This acknowledgment, according to McGurty, leads to affluent and powerful communities opposing not only issues that happen in their own backyard, but also environmental injustices faced by low-income and minority neighborhoods. McGurty's views on NIMBYism seems to fit into the resource mobilization theory better than Bullard's as resource mobilization assumes that EJ groups need funding and resources to mobilize, and McGurty theorizes that these resources come from assistance provided by NIMBY communities.

McGurty acknowledges that environmental justice activism was led by the affected minority communities, but with the help of NIMBY communities, who helped by using their greater access to political as well as monetary resources. McGurty acknowledges the challenges that EJ movements experience in mobilizing resources, and therefore establishes that the evolution of NIMBYism into environmental justice has been able to provide more resources for EJ movements to succeed. There is little research that bridges Bullard's and McGurty's views on NIMBYism and its relation to environmental justice, and this paper aims to do that by focusing on a case study comparing NIMBY and EJ movements aimed against the same polluting facility.

Because of this discrepancy within the resource mobilization method, there is a gap in the literature which calls for the need for more research involving EJ movements in affluent, predominantly white communities and their ability to mobilize resources in order to defend their community. Although most of the research when it comes to environmental dangers in affluent communities looks at it from a NIMBY (Not-In-My-Backyard) perspective (MCGurty 1997 and 2009, Bullard 1990), there is also the need for comparative studies analyzing the different ways affluent, white communities and minority low-income communities organize against the same environmental dangers.

BACKGROUND

In order to understand the complexities of the case studies I conducted on the movements against General Iron by both the Southeast Side and the North Side residents of Chicago, it is necessary to contextualize these movements within the history of Chicago's zoning policies, the environmental injustices associated with these, and finally the EJ movements that have emerged from these inequalities. I will also expand upon the individual histories of the Lincoln Park and Southeast Side neighborhoods, and touch on how each of these neighborhoods' socioeconomic and demographic compositions fit into these broader zoning structures.

CHICAGO'S ZONING POLICIES AND ENVIRONMENTAL (IN)JUSTICE

The history of Chicago surrounding environmental injustice and environmental racism is extremely pertinent to understanding the General Iron case. Schertzer, Twinam and Walsh (2017) outline how Chicago's historic discriminatory zoning policies have led to industrial zoning being "disproportionately allocated to neighborhoods populated by ethnic and racial minorities," (217).

They find that Chicago's zoning policies have forced minority and low-income populations into neighborhoods plagued with environmental hazards and toxic waste sites, forcing these populations to suffer from disproportionate health and environmental consequences from pollution. To support this argument, they look at how housing access and "the availability of affordable housing may cause low-income residents to cluster in areas with locally undesirable land uses," (ibid).

However, these communities were not always sites of polluting facilities. In a paper that interrogates the timeline around the presence of toxic facilities in disadvantaged neighborhoods ("A New 'Chicken-or-Egg' Debate"), Robert Bullard has shown that "most neighborhood communities were established before the noxious facilities were sited" (1994). The establishment of the Calumet Industrial Corridor emerged after the 1980s when the steel mills in the area shut down, leaving the area collapsed economically and environmentally. Workers were left without jobs, and the land was left contaminated by the facilities. This land was also left open for more polluting industries to come in, further contaminating the area. According to Bullard (1994), this area being industrially zoned-in would have been done purposefully by the government to disproportionately site industrial facilities in minority communities. Schertzer, Twinam and Walsh's (2017) paper supports Bullard's (1994) views on the impacts of zoning policies in the creation of industrial corridors in minority neighborhoods. The former outlines the 1923 zoning ordinance as one of the most important policies of its time, and finds it to be an "exclusionary" zoning policy which excluded minority communities from the "economic benefits of low density, purely residential zoning," proving that these "zoning ordinances may have been used to

concentrate minorities in denser neighborhoods, potentially contributing to segregation and environmental disparities," (Schertzer, Twinam and Walsh 2017, 219).

These zoning policies have had long-term consequences for where industrial waste sites are dumped in the city of Chicago. Exemplifying these long-term consequences is the Southeast Side: not only is the community where General Iron was relocating to predominantly composed of Latinx residents but it also has a lower economic status and higher income inequality than many other areas of Chicago, as 92% of the Latino and Black residents living in this area live below the poverty level (Samee and Ortiz 2021). Redlining, a racist practice that limits people from living in certain areas with economic as well as other discriminatory displacement policies, has a lot to do with the disparities in economic levels between different neighborhoods in Chicago. According to NBC News, Chicago's historically redlined areas overlap with the areas that are being used as locations for polluting industries. Housing segregation was used as a way to present inner-city neighborhoods as "unsafe," limiting them from receiving investments and loans, therefore leading to further economic instability in these communities (Samee and Ortiz 2021). The effects of redlining in low-income communities of color in Chicago are still prevalent to this day; according to an article on South Side Weekly, "from 2012 through 2018 [...] banks made more loans in majority-white Lincoln Park than in all of Chicago's Black neighborhoods combined" (Reidy 2021). Factoring the practices of redlining into General Iron's push to move its plant into a lower-income neighborhood points to the centuries of income inequality that these communities have faced due to racist systemic practices.

Going back to Bullard's 1994 paper, we can see how these policies in Chicago disproportionately impact minority communities of color, especially in the South Side, but we

can also see how the consequences of these zoning policies have affected other residential areas such as the Lincoln Park neighborhood. The North Branch industrial corridor was zoned in in the early 20th century when Finkl Steel opened in this area (Downes 2019). At the time of Finkl Steel moving into Lincoln Park, this area was not the residential neighborhood it is today. But, as Lincoln Park became more residential at the end of the 20th century, this plant was shut down. The company later bought a lot in the Southeast Side of Chicago in 2006, and by 2014 began operating in this area. Here, a pattern can be seen with the relocation of General Iron from the North Side into the Southeast Side. As Lincoln Park became more residential, with white affluent families moving into this area, noxious facilities began relocating to lower-income, minority areas in Chicago's South Side. The North Branch industrial corridor is now Chicago's first industrial corridor under review and redevelopment, making room for the new Lincoln Yards redevelopment project which aims at redeveloping the toxic land left by these industries in this area by bringing in parks and green spaces. Unfortunately, as the North side becomes redeveloped, the Southeast Side gets left behind. The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) article "Environmental Justice in Chicago," shows the disparities between the treatment of the industry in the North side and in the Southside: while efforts are being made by the city to relocate industry out of the North Side, the Southeast Side does not see any redevelopment coming their way anytime soon, in fact, it becomes the dumping ground for these facilities leaving the North Side (Mulvihill 2020).

CHICAGO'S ZONING POLICIES AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MOVEMENTS

The South and Southeast Sides of Chicago have been battling against the dumping of industrial waste sites in their area for many years since it was zoned in as an industrial corridor. In this

section I will show how grievance-based EJ movements have emerged from facing harmful pollution and waste from companies such as Finkl Steel and General Iron, which I have touched upon. These battles have made the Southeast Side of Chicago infamous for its environmental justice movements, some of these leading to great victories. One of the most famous of these movements started with the "Mother of Environmental Justice," Hazel Johnson, a native Southeast Sider and the founder of People for Community Recovery (PCR), as a response to environmental injustices in her community in the 1970s. Since then, many more organizations and movements have emerged in the South Side of Chicago, leading to some important victories, such as Executive Order 12898 in 1994 which required federal agencies to include EJ in their decision-making processes. Hazel Johnson and a group of activists were the driving force behind getting Executive Order 12898 passed, and Johnson was present at the White House when the order was signed (Hautzinger 2020). This order helped ensure that communities of color and low-income communities were not unfairly burdened by environmental hazards. Other more general EJ victories that came out of successful EJ movement organizing around the country include the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act passed in 1970 and 1972 respectively, and the Fair Energy Jobs Act and the Climate and Equitable Jobs Act in 2021.

Despite these victories, recent EJ movements have had to continuously battle against incoming polluters in this area. Prior to the General Iron case, the Southeast Side was campaigning against petroleum coke (petcoke), or fugitive dust stored in the neighborhood as a byproduct of oil refining. The Southeast Side Coalition to Ban Petcoke emerged in 2012 as a response to piles of petcoke discovered stored in the neighborhood, exacerbating breathing problems such as asthma. A health consultation analysis of petcoke in this area found that "blown

dust from the piles poses a public health hazard to residents living adjacent to the piles" ("U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES" 2016). This coalition united different EJ organizations in the SE Side, such as People for Community Recovery, Bridges // Puentes, and the Southeast Side Environmental Task Force, successfully banning petcoke. Soon after this success, in 2018, the city announced plans for relocating the polluting industrial facility General Iron from Lincoln Park to the Southeast Side. This relocation reinforces Bullard's (1994) and Schertzer, Twinam and Walsh's (2017) claims of the long-term effects of racist zoning policies in Chicago. After several experiences with mobilizing against environmental injustices, the same Southeast Side EJ groups were ready to unite under the General Iron case, creating the Stop General Iron coalition, and were eventually successful in getting the company's permit denied. However, this victory is not the end of the story as the company is still pushing against the city's decision to deny the permit, and are suing the city to get the permit back. This pushback from the company despite a rightfully denied permit shows how the Southeast Side industrial corridor is still being treated as a dumping ground, and Southeast Siders will continue battling these injustices to protect their community.

DATA AND METHODS

In order to understand how the communities of Lincoln Park and the Southeast Side, which have very different demographics in terms of socioeconomic status and race and ethnicity, have mobilized against environmental dangers and polluters, specifically the General Iron Industries recycling plant, I conducted in-depth interviews with residents of both communities. Interviews were appropriate to answering my research question as they allowed me to explore the

experiences and perspectives of participants from both neighborhoods in a more in-depth and nuanced way than any other data collection methods, such as surveys or secondary data analysis. This is due to the in-depth aspect of the interviews I conducted, which encourages participants to tell their own stories in detail, allowing for a large breadth of data available for analysis. In addition, previous notable studies of this nature such as Baugh (2016), Capek (2014), Cock (2004), and Shilling (2009) have further established interviews as a suitable methodology for analyzing case studies on environmental justice movements.

These two neighborhoods occupy different parts of the City of Chicago and despite their historical similarities, have radically diverged in terms of demographic and environmental and economic health. The Southeast Side of Chicago is a low-income neighborhood composed of a majority of Latinx, Black, and Brown residents, whereas Lincoln Park is an affluent and predominantly white neighborhood on the North Side of Chicago. According to the 2015 Census, the Southeast Side's population is 58.7% Latinx and 24.5% Black, and only 16% white ("10th Ward Data" 2015). This area is within the Calumet Industrial Corridor which is Chicago's "largest industrial corridor - one of more than two dozen areas across the city that historically were designated for manufacturing and other industrial uses," ("CITY of CHICAGO Air Quality and Health Report 2020") meaning that this area has historically been overburdened with industrial pollution as a result of environmentally racist zoning policies. The prevalence of industrial manufacturing plants in this neighborhood has manifested in some of the worst indexes for air quality (9th percentile) according to the City of Chicago Air Quality and Health Report (2020). Lincoln Park, on the other hand, is overwhelmingly white, with a 77.7% white population, and only 5.43% and 4.06% Hispanic and Black populations, respectively ("Lake

View & Lincoln Park PUMA, IL | Data USA" 2020). The same Air Quality and Health Report finds this neighborhood to have some of the best indexes for air quality (1st percentile) in Chicago.

The findings in this study are based on 14 semi-structured, in-depth interviews that I conducted with a sample of people who were, in distinct ways, involved with the campaigns to shut down General Iron from Lincoln Park, as well as to prevent it from relocating to the Southeast Side of Chicago. The interviews took place over the span of two and a half months, from the start of January 2023 to the middle of March of the same year, and were, in average, an hour long in length. Interviews were conducted on a private Zoom call and were recorded and transcribed. All of the participants' data was kept in a private folder and was disposed of after the interviews were analyzed. In addition, to protect respondents' identities, all personal data has been kept confidential and the names of all respondents have been anonymized. Due to the semi-structured nature of the interviews, I was able to create a rough interview guide which consisted of ten questions, but I was also able to deviate from the questions to create a more intimate and personalized conversation with each interviewee. I gained access to my participants via snowball sampling; after each interview, I asked for additional contacts that they might have who would be interested in participating in my research. I recruited each of these additional contacts either via email or phone, and set up meeting times over Zoom.

Of these 14 interviews, 5 were with Lincoln Park residents, including two organizers on the North side, and the rest were with either residents or organizers in the Southeast Side. Of the former, three of these were with residents who have lived in Lincoln Park for over twenty years, and the remaining two moved into the area a few years before General Iron was shut down in

2020. All of the Lincoln Park interviewees identify as white (non-Hispanic), which is representative of the predominantly white neighborhood they live in. As for the SE Side interviews, three of these were with activists who either work on the SE side or are part of various EJ organizations in Chicago that joined in the campaign against General Iron in the Southeast Side, while the remaining six are SE Side residents, who also organized in their community. While I do not have specific ethnic and racial demographics for each of the Southeast Side interviewees, I know that five respondents identify as Latinx and one respondent identifies as Black (African American). This is also mostly representative of the majority Latinx and Black population of the Southeast Side, although a limitation in my study is shown by a lack of Black representation in the Southeast Side interviewee pool. Overall, respondents' demographics varied greatly, with ages ranging from the youngest respondent in their mid-20s, to the oldest respondent in their late 60s. Additionally, ten of the respondents I spoke to are females, while the remaining four are males.

During the interviews, each respondent was asked to report their place of birth and where they live now: all respondents are currently residing in Chicago except for one. I further asked respondents several questions including how they first became aware of General Iron's relocation, why they chose to participate in this campaign at their own level of involvement and to expand upon what level of involvement they took on during the movement. Finally, after transcribing my interviews, I engaged with each of these through a coding process where I read through and analyzed several themes and patterns that emerged. I then picked out and grouped together quotes from each interview that pertained to each theme to analyze the patterns of how each interviewee contributed to each theme. This process follows the coding process described

by Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (2011) which states that "The ethnographer may reorganize and revise previously written in-process and code memos, identifying a theme or issue that cuts across a number of these memos and pulling together relevant materials," (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011, 193)

RESULTS

While both communities ultimately triumphed against General Iron, the ways in which they framed the issue confronting their community and how they mobilized against it could not have been more different. My interviews revealed two major themes when it comes to the framing of each community's problems with General Iron, which have led to differing mobilization strategies by each neighborhood to organize against this company. These two communities were able to triumph against General Iron with different framing and mobilization strategies. This is due partly to their relative experiences in dealing with EJ organizing, as well as their differing socioeconomic and racial makeup which have historical significance when it comes to the city's treatment of these communities. In terms of framing, Lincoln Park residents take on a Not-In-My-Back-Yard (NIMBY) approach to their opposition to General Iron (GI), while Southeast Side residents and activists take on a necessary defensive environmental justice framing to protect what they call their already "overburdened" community against yet another industrial hazard. In the following sections, I demonstrate that the movements against General Iron by each neighborhood were different in terms of how they framed their problems against the company, as well as how they used these framings to mobilize with various strategies. This is shown through the Southeast Side's use of environmental justice framing, and their reliance on previously

established EJ organizing networks. On the other hand, Lincoln Park uses NIMBY framing in order to get General Iron out of their neighborhood.

OPPOSING FRAMES USED BY THE SOUTHEAST SIDE AND LINCOLN PARK

In this section I will be expanding upon framing opposition between both neighborhoods: While Lincoln Park residents organized to get General Iron out of their community, residents of the Southeast Side organized to prevent General Irom from relocating into their community. Generally, respondents from both of these areas believe that General Iron is disruptive to the environment, as well as to the health of residents in each community. Both Lincoln Park and Southeast Side residents are opposed to hosting General Iron in their communities for multiple reasons, such as air and environmental pollution, health concerns, community safety, ecological reasons, and reasons for social justice and worker's rights. My interviews revealed that the most important reason for this opposition to the plant, for both communities, is about health and environmental concerns about pollution — both air and noise pollution — emanating from the plant.

However, while both of these communities are opposed to hosting GI for health and environmental reasons, their framings of these oppositions within each of their claims are distinct: Lincoln Park residents approach their opposition as a NIMBY (Not-In-My-Back-Yard) situation. Not only do most Lincoln Parkers I interviewed frame their mobilization against General Iron with NIMBY sentiments, such as worrying about property taxes decreasing and a lack of concern over where the plant would go if moved from their neighborhood, but they also make it clear that their movement was in no way trying to cause systemic change, but merely

aims at getting General Iron out of their area, a sentiment which agrees with Robert Bullard's arguments against NIMBYism. However, some of my interviewees seek to challenge this view, engaging in a NIMBYism that aligns itself more closely to McGurty's (1997) views on how NIMBYism can positively impact EJ movements.

On the other hand, the Stop General Iron movement in the Southeast Side, and members of EJ groups in Chicago that participated in this movement, frame this issue as one of environmental injustice and environmental racism, as well as a class issue. Further, Stop General Iron's framing strives to enact change on a systemic level, by aiming to restructure the discriminative zoning laws that have allowed for the SE Side to become an industrial corridor. To do this, this movement took to framing their issue as a matter of human rights, highlighting how this relocation represents a civil rights violation, and calling for a restructuring of the political process for how industrial waste sites are brought into neighborhoods. They do this by calling for more community-based approaches to policy, as well as calling for cumulative impacts analyses that determine whether bringing in a new facility into an already overburdened community would be harmful. Finally, the Stop General Iron movement also takes advantage of non-political opportunities, primarily the COVID-19 pandemic, to frame their movement. They do this by leveraging the fact that COVID-19 is a respiratory virus that predominantly affects minority and low-income communities like the Southeast Side (McNeely 2021), and so the placement of a hazardous waste site that would exacerbate lung problems in this neighborhood, in the middle of a respiratory virus, is framed as overtly discriminatory and classist.

Stop General Iron's Framing Strategies: Environmental justice, non-political opportunities, and community-centered approaches

In this section, I will be analyzing the framing strategies used by the Stop General Iron movement in the Southeast Side. These include the framing of the plant relocation as an environmental justice issue, as well as their leverage of COVID-19 as a non-political opportunity, and a call for community-centered approaches when dealing with unwanted land use. At the end of this section, I will also be looking at counterexamples, or Southeast Side residents who did not participate in the movement.

Starting off with framing the relocation as an EJ issue, I will begin by quoting my interview with Maria. When asked about the reasons why she opposed General Iron relocating into her neighborhood in the Southeast Side, Maria's response summarizes many key themes that I have discussed. Maria, born and raised in the Southeast Side with her Mexican family, now works at a local automobile plant in the 10th ward, and is part of the Southeast Side Environmental Task Force organization:

> I mean we already live in a sacrifice zone where we are already overburdened by toxic waste, and here comes General Iron... I mean it's not just my family but everybody knows somebody who has died of cancer has had some kind of you know lung issue. And we have uh some of the highest cancer rates in the country, not just city but in the country but also asthma, you know any kind of lung disease, pulmonary issues like just skyrocket like higher than other parts of the city or other parts of country and, who knows how much worse this would get with General Iron's relocation. So, we couldn't have that here… (Zoom Interview, January 20th 2023)

In this quote, it is clear that Maria's main concern in keeping General Iron out of her community is to protect the health of not only her family but also her neighbors. Therefore, Maria is displaying an EJ framing to describe the relocation. This is more explicitly stated by Maria further on in her interview, when she says:

> I really started getting more involved in this environmental justice movement because living in these sacrifice zones, you know? I said, well we deserve to have clean air land and water too, you know, not just the people on the North side that are paying more in taxes or whatever. (Zoom Interview, January 20th 2023)

Maria's responses echo similar responses I got from other residents in the Southeast Side about health concerns. For example, another of these responses comes from Lorena, who grew up in the Northeast suburbs of Chicago, and now lives in the city. Although Lorena doesn't live in the Southeast Side, she works as a social studies teacher at George Washington High School, the school across the street from the General Iron relocation site. Lorena, although not directly affected by this issue as she does not live in the 10th ward, joined the Stop General Iron campaign, and even participated in a solidarity 1-day hunger strike for the movement, as she believes that it is her duty as a teacher to protect her students from environmental dangers:

> And so the only reason, like the reason I'm a teacher is to defend my students and their communities and make sure that they have everything that they need to be successful and like I literally can't teach when kids are missing school because they're having asthma attack or like there's truck traffic that is making it dangerous for students to like walk near the school. (Zoom Interview, January 13th 2023)

Like Maria, Lorena also frames the danger of General Iron's proposed relocation as a potential threat to the health of those in the neighborhood. She is concerned that the plant will introduce additional major challenges to her students' learning if they cannot attend school because they are sick or struggling with their health. Lorena's and Maria's responses parallel the concept that residents in all communities should be able to "live, work and play" (Novotny 2000) in safe and healthy environments that are affected by disproportionate industrial waste and pollution, regardless of race or socioeconomic status. Lorena also touches on themes of inequality and organizing to eliminate discriminatory zoning laws that allow for environmental

inequality later in the interview, saying that “we need to put an end to these environmentally racist practices and sacrifice zones,” (ibid).

In the following examples, I will show how the movement frames COVID-19 as an EJ issue that disproportionately impacts minority and low-income communities like the SE Side, and how COVID-19 was used to leverage the movement’s EJ framing in order to achieve their goals in getting the General Iron permit denied. Maria exemplifies this by speaking on the influence of the COVID-19 pandemic on mobilizing against General Iron:

> This [the movement] really got its height during the pandemic, during the start of the pandemic in 2020 we started organizing and, [...] you know, maybe there's some good and bad things you can get a bunch of people together online and [...] the people just showed up like I'm talking like multigenerational, multiracial like and it was basically mostly people from our neighborhood, and little by little other organizations joined us in solidarity and we made national, not just national but international news. And I think this has to do with the fact that we were so vulnerable during the pandemic, seeing as it was something that affects neighborhoods like ours more than other more affluent areas, and we could use that to our advantage to protest. (Zoom Interview, January 20th 2023)

Maria’s response shows how she considers the decision to relocate General Iron into her neighborhood as being classist and racist, especially amid a respiratory pandemic in a neighborhood that already suffers from high rates of asthma and other breathing problems. Finally, Maria touches on the good side of organizing during the pandemic, which is that people were able to come together online and garner a lot of news and media attention on an issue that might otherwise not have been as impactful. In this response, we can see how non-political opportunities, such as COVID-19 can be effective mobilizing strategies if framed by a movement successfully, counteracting the emphasis that the political process model puts on political opportunities as necessary for successful movement mobilization.

Other residents of the Southeast Side also share the same sentiments in the intersections between COVID-19 as a respiratory virus and their own movement that seeks to put an end to the systems that zone in polluters into this neighborhood, further exacerbating respiratory issues. When talking about getting rid of these zoning laws, using phrases such as "overburdened by toxic waste" as well as descriptions of their community as a "sacrifice zone" to really accentuate the messaging they were trying to elucidate with their framing of this issue. As an example, in an interview with Louie, a Southeast Side resident in his mid-twenties who was born and raised in the 10th ward, he explained:

> Our neighborhood is mostly known in Chicago as an environmental justice community, one that has suffered years of historical environmental racism, and has been zoned in as a sacrifice zone in our city. However, by fighting back against these practices, our goal here is to redefine this perception. (Zoom Interview, February 27 2023)

Here, Louie eloquently ties together several themes I have touched on, from framing the General Iron relocation as an issue of environmental racism to aiming at getting rid of zoning laws that force low-income, minority communities to live in sacrifice zones. Not only was Louie one of the leaders of the Stop General Iron campaign, but he also went ahead to create his own youth-led group in the Southeast Side to get more youths involved in the movement. It is clear from Louie's responses that he was very involved in the campaign, and therefore is well aware of how to frame this movement effectively to achieve their goals. When doing this, he did not forget to mention COVID as one of the most important opportunities that helped lead this movement to success:

> It [COVID] helped on our end. It was like, COVID is respiratory, and General Iron was going to bring in pollution…you know what I'm saying? Pollution is respiratory too. Let's

> do something about it, right? And, and COVID also encouraged more involvement and people to join the cause. (Zoom Interview, February 27 2023)

These examples are important when considering the framing tactics used by the Stop General Iron movement, and they also show how these framings were used in order to get the movement to realize its goals. The following quote is from Ariana, an attorney at the Environmental Law and Policy Center (ELPC) who was part of the Stop General Iron campaign. Part of Ariana's job at the ELPC is to ensure that communities are receiving cumulative impacts analyses that determine whether bringing in a new facility into an already overburdened community would harm said community. Ariana argues that cumulative impacts analyses are vital to get the General Iron permit denied, but that it should not be necessary to resort to protests and hunger strikes for this to happen. When asked to explain what a cumulative impacts analysis involves, Ariana states:

> I'm oversimplifying it but it involves doing a cumulative impact analysis of all of the different things that a particular area is exposed to. And so it's looking at the detriments, the assets… and how that impacts that population [...] And so, with General Iron that includes looking at things like asthma rates in a community [...] because they are all pieces to this larger puzzle of how pollution impacts people. And so the idea is you come up with this analysis and then it either puts greater limitations on what a facility can do or prevents a facility from even moving into a neighborhood in the first place… (Zoom Interview, January 30th 2023)

Here, it is clear that through the push for cumulative impacts analysis for General Iron, Ariana is trying to advocate for all EJ movements in general, and seeking to reform zoning policies systematically with the use of these analyses. Finally, Ariana uses this to discuss other important topics of centering affected and vulnerable communities, "there were different critiques of how [the analysis] was done. And the idea is that with any sort of analysis, you

should be listening to the community the entire time and focus on what factors to take into account…" (Zoom Interview, January 30th 2023).

This brings me into the last framing strategy used against General Iron that was coded in my interviews, which is the need for community-centered approaches with the affected community where an incoming waste site is to be located. This is exemplified by another quote from Maria where she describes this need to hold accessible and community-centered meetings when discussing these issues, which she states was not something the Southeast Side was given with General Iron:

> The city said, okay, we're gonna do a couple of town halls, right? But it was very poorly managed. Like when they scheduled them and when they were going to have them in person or online, one of them, they tried to have it at my union hall without even me knowing about it. And I'm one of the leaders in my union, you know, I'm on a few committees, I'm on the election or whatever. I mean a few committees, I'm involved. I was like, how did I not know that the city was planning a meeting at my hall? And I said at the time they planned it. I'm like, don't they know that this is during shift change? (Zoom Interview, January 20th 2023)

Here, Maria is asking for better accessibility to the Town Halls that the city was scheduling in order to discuss the General Iron situation with the local residents. These town halls were being scheduled during times that were not convenient for people, and without telling the residents and organizers when and where these meetings were being scheduled. In summary, the residents of the Southeast Side's voices were not being centered by the city in their decisions to bring General Iron into their neighborhood. And, this is further shown by an even more exemplary example, told to me by Lana, who is actually a resident of Lincoln Park who organized in both neighborhoods to get rid of General Iron in the North Side, and to deny the permit in the Southeast Side:

> Um, there was a meeting that was supposed to be happening with Doctor Arwady [the Commissioner of the Chicago Department of Public Health (CDPH)] and the Alderman on the Southeast side to talk about the status of the [General Iron] move to the SE Side with that community. Um, and they got word that some North fighters were going to be joining that, um, that call. And so our Alderman sent out a notice to our community saying, um, we're gonna have our own call, and so you don't need to attend that call, you should just attend our call. And it was a moment when I was like, they are trying to divide us, they are trying to, um, they are trying to keep us separate so that we will back down on supporting them… (Zoom Interview, March 3rd 2023)

Here, Lana reveals a ploy by the aldermen of each ward to keep the meetings between the Southeast Side organizers and the North Side organizers separate in order to not let them join coalitions. This act by the city is the opposite of what Marcelina and the rest of Stop General Iron were asking for when calling for a community-based approach based on Figueroa's (2003) concept of participatory justice. Due to this lack of communication with the residents of the Southeast side, which was clearly on purpose, Stop General Iron had to take to radical mobilization strategies to achieve their goals.

So far, I have analyzed several framing strategies used by the Southeast Side against the General Iron relocation, from framing it as an EJ issue, to leveraging COVID-19 for their advantage, as well as calling for community-based approaches to the siting of polluting facilities. These framing strategies demonstrate how members of Stop General Iron understand this issue as a violation of their right to "live, work and play" (Novotny 2000) in environments that are equally safe and healthy as more affluent residential neighborhoods in Chicago. These framings also suggest that Southeast Siders' main goal is to not only prevent General Iron from relocating into their community but to also call for a restructuring of zoning policies in Chicago so that

their community, and other disenfranchised communities, won't have to deal with these issues of environmental inequality again.

While these examples reveal reasons for why respondents from the Southeast Side were motivated to mobilize against General Iron, I want to also touch on residents of the SE Side who were exposed to the same factors and conditions as these respondents, but who did not join in on the mobilization to protect their neighborhood against environmental harms. Speaking with Maria about her co-workers at her manufacturing job, I was able to gain some insight into this population. Maria revealed to me that, although many of her co-workers were not able to join the Stop General Iron movement due to the risks of losing their jobs, they still supported her when the permit was denied in the end:

> When I went back to work or my union meeting, actually a lot of the guys who weren't supportive in this fight, who didn't say anything about it because of fear of losing their jobs, [were actually supportive when] they saw me on the news [when the permit got denied]. They're like, "hey, I saw you on the news, good job." Like, "yeah, thanks… Thanks for not helping." (Zoom Interview, January 20th, 2023)

It is clear that Maria found this movement so important to go so far as risking her job in order to organize against General Iron. This was a shared sentiment for most Southeast Siders who risked their jobs to fight for the safety of their community, including Lorena who put her teaching job on the line to fight for her students, telling me that "Lori Lightfoot tried getting me and another teacher fired […] I truly believed my career was over but when we won, it was truly unbelievable because I know there's a long history of fighting teachers for political reasons [...] And so [...] I put my job on the line, which I would gladly do again." However, some people just could not risk their jobs for monetary and security reasons.

These insights reveal that while many residents found the movement's goals important enough to put their jobs and livelihoods on the line, others who were being affected similarly either did not find the movement's goals to be important enough to risk their income for it, or did not understand the importance of this movement in protecting themselves and their neighborhood. As Alberto, the founder of an EJ organization that joined the Stop General Iron campaign states, "A lot of our community residents had no clue whatsoever about what environmental racism or what environmental justice is about" (Zoom Interview, January 11th 2023).

Lincoln Park's Framing Strategies: NIMBYism and Protecting Property Values

Returning to the theme of framing opposition, I'd like to discuss how Lincoln Parkers framed their own movement to get General Iron out of their neighborhood in ways that are significantly contrasting to the frames used by Southeast Side residents. In this section, I will show that Lincoln Parkers were hesitant in attributing health effects to General Iron's pollution, due to a concern that their property values could decrease because of this. At the same time, this shows how, through the use of a NIMBY framing, residents displayed the behavior that Bullard (1990) opposes to get rid of General Iron in their own neighborhood without considering where the facility would be relocated to once shut down in Lincoln Park. On the other hand, I will further expand upon how McGurty's views on NIMBYism are reflected by one interviewee who used her own experience organizing against General Iron to subsequently help the Southeast Side organize against the same company. These results show how the effects of higher socioeconomic status and racial privilege interact with movement framing strategies.

Going back to the Southeast Sides' use of harmful health effects to frame their opposition to General Iron, I looked at how Maria and Lorena were both quick to blame industrial operations such as General Iron for being disruptive to peoples' health. On the other hand, the Lincoln Park residents that I spoke to were less willing to correlate negative health impacts with General Iron's operations. When asked about this, Gabriel, a resident of Lincoln Park who resided a couple of blocks away from the plant for over twenty years, responded that although he cannot correlate the pollution produced by General Iron with his son's breathing problems, he believes it definitely did not make it better:

> So yeah, I would just say breathing in these fumes and these toxins is terrible. And, you know, [my son] has a little asthma, I mean. Is it related to General Iron? I don't know, but it sure didn't help... Yeah, I think you've got to be very cautious. Correlation and causation is a huge difference. So. But he did have asthma and I know that the particulate matter was horrible and it smelled. And was it General Iron? Was it the steel mill? Was it the foundry? Was it the tannery? Was it all of that? I don't know. So that's why I don't want to pin it all on General Iron. General Iron was just goddamn noisy as hell. I mean, it was like... *imitates loud noise* (Zoom Interview, January 13th 2023)

As seen in this quote, Gabriel acknowledges the harms that might have been caused by General Iron, or other industrial waste in the area, but is more hesitant to attribute any health impacts such as his son's asthma to industrial pollution. This hesitation to attribute any health effects resulting from General Iron's pollution to the facility may be in the interest of keeping the property values in this neighborhood from decreasing. This is another framing issue which is embedded in NIMBYism, which I will speak more about further on in this section. Instead of attributing harmful health effects to General Iron, Gabriel's main concern when it came to getting General Iron out of his neighborhood was the noise pollution, exemplified by the last part of the

quote above, as well as in other parts of the interview, such as when he told me “the worst thing for me was the noise,” (Zoom Interview, January 13th 2023).

It is interesting to juxtapose Gabriel’s answer to those provided by Southeast Side residents. On the one hand, Gabriel’s main concern is the loud noise produced by GI’s operations, even though he knows that the plant was producing other forms of pollution such as particulate matter. However, he chooses to focus on the noise issue. On the other hand, the residents and organizers of the Southeast Side’s main concerns have to do with peoples’ safety concerning health and truck traffic, and their main goals are to get rid of the discriminatory zoning laws that allow for industrial operations to be sited near residential neighborhoods, especially low-income minority neighborhoods. This shows how socioeconomic status affects how environmental issues are framed.

Gabriel’s responses reveal a pattern that I found in most Lincoln Park interviews I conducted, which is that their main goal was always to get General Iron out of Lincoln Park, without paying any mind to where the plant would be relocated to. This is where we run into the NIMBY framing used by Lincoln Parkers to get General Iron shut down in their neighborhood. Another quote from Gabriel demonstrates a lack of concern regarding GI’s plans to relocate from the North Side to the Southeast Side:

> My understanding was [that General Iron would relocate to] a much more industrial area, not densely populated. Okay? It made good economic sense and it provided good jobs for the folks there. And it wasn't going to be an outdoor pollution thing [...] And I'm not going to defend General Iron… But that was my understanding. And what happened is that you know, people were like [...] you're going to just, you know, bring all this pollution and particulate matter to another neighborhood, a poor neighborhood or

> something. There was a whole "story" [air quotes], you know, a “social justice story” [air quotes] behind it or whatever which, you know, arguably if they aren't improving and if they didn't enclose it, **I wouldn't want them in my backyard either.** Don't get me wrong, I hated them. But I don't know... What was the plan? Did they get EPA? But what type of research did they do? You know, you have to be fair to them… (Zoom Interview, January 23 2023)

Here, Gabriel took a mocking and condescending tone when addressing the protests in the Southeast Side, and it seemed to me as I spoke with Gabriel that he was making fun of the efforts this community undertook to keep General Iron out of their area, reducing this issue of “social justice,” as an unimportant matter that should be laughed at. Gabriel’s tone as well as the comments he makes can be attributed to his privileged lifestyle, and his ignorance concerning issues of environmental justice, as, living in Lincoln Park, this is not a recurring problem that residents have to deal with. In addition, Gabriel takes a sympathetic tone toward General Iron. By giving the company the benefit of the doubt, Gabriel is once again acknowledging that this situation is not part of a bigger structural issue of environmental racism, but that the Southeast Side should not be so quick to reject the company even with its environmental pollution. Gabriel’s answer reveals Bullard’s negative views on NIMBYism and how it affects EJ negatively, as he explicitly states “I wouldn’t want them in my backyard either.”

An interview I conducted with Karen, an attorney who has resided in Lincoln Park for over twenty years, and who worked for General Iron doing in-house legal work for the company, follows these patterns of NIMBYism as well as providing an explicit pro-General Iron perspective that stood out from the rest of my interviews. Karen was persistent in stating that she is on General Iron’s side because “they [GI] were there first, before most of these residents

moved in." When talking about how she felt after she heard that GI's permit was denied in the Southeast Side, Karen said:

> [I felt] very disheartened obviously because uh feeling that, you know, they moved everything, dismantled everything, you know, basically on the assurance that assuming that we met the met or exceeded the, you know, environmental, um you know, rules or whatever, which we did. And it was, um, you know, the city's own experts indicated that we had met all the standards. (Zoom Interview, February 3rd 2023)

Despite being a resident of Lincoln Park, Karen defended the company strongly, telling me she never experienced any pollution or health effects from the facility: "Maybe the ground was already polluted but that, you know, that that wasn't from us," (Zoom Interview, February 3rd 2023). Karen also attributed her neighbors' organizing against General Iron to being motivated solely by "personal financial reasons for themselves. It was an issue of protecting their own property value," (Zoom Interview, February 3rd 2023). Finally, when asked directly what she thought about the pollution Lincoln Parkers had attributed to General Iron in the past, she asked to end the interview halfway through, giving me an excuse that she had to leave immediately. She told me to contact her if I had any more questions, which I did, to no response. This behavior reveals that Karen did not want to engage in the interview in fear of being on record speaking about issues of pollution and General Iron. She may have been worried about her future employment opportunities if it got out that she was speaking on these issues, even though I disclosed to her at the beginning of the interview that all of her answers would be made anonymous. This further shows how financial motives underlie Lincoln Parkers' framings of the issue at hand.

Karen does bring up an interesting issue that addresses Lincoln Parkers' lack of action against General Iron in fear of their property values decreasing. A similar sentiment was identified in a few other Lincoln Park interviews, such as when Kelly, a longtime resident of this neighborhood who was not very involved in the movement, told me that: "some people were ok, ok with not saying anything [about their complaints against GI] because they thought that saying something would bring down the value of our property. But a lot of us thought, well, our health is more important," (Zoom Interview, March 6th 2023). Kelly's main involvement in this movement, as for most Lincoln Parkers I interviewed, was signing and distributing petitions against General Iron.

While Karen explicitly defends General Iron, most Lincoln Parkers I interviewed do this less directly, further reproducing the NIMBY structures that cause harm to marginalized communities. On the other hand, my interview with Lana represents the only interviewee who challenges Bullard's perspectives on NIMBYism. Lana uses NIMBY framing to actively defend the Southeast Side while at the same time opposing General Iron in the North Side, exhibiting a framing strategy that aligns with McGurty's NIMBYism. When talking about her own experiences mobilizing against General Iron in the North Side, Lana states that the group she founded to oppose General Iron, Clean the North Branch, started with eight Lincoln Parkers on the board. However, once she started taking a more radical approach and engaging with efforts that pushed against NIMBYism, people started dropping out. Lana explains this in the following way:

> We started using the slogan "comply or goodbye, because we knew that if we couldn't get them into compliance on the North side, [we] wouldn't be able to get them into

> compliance anywhere in Chicago… but, as the conversation progressed, some people felt less and less in the "comply and goodbye," and more in the "if they just leave our neighborhood, we're ok with that" (Zoom Interview, March 3rd 2023)

Here, Lana shows that she was willing to use NIMBYism as a way to not only get General Iron out of her own neighborhood, but also prevent it from relocating into another neighborhood. Her use of "comply or goodbye," as a slogan shows that she was not willing to let General Iron relocate somewhere else if they weren't going to comply with the Environmental Protection Agency's rules in controlling their environmental and noise pollution. This is reflective of McGurty's (1997) views on NIMBYism. However, once Lana's framing shifted in this way in order to protect other communities from facing the same problems, other Lincoln Parkers began to drop out of her organization, further proving that most were only organizing in order to get General Iron out of their own community, but with no interest in protecting other communities from these harms as well.

Therefore, Lincoln Parkers overall were not engaging in these framing strategies in order to restructure the systemic problem of environmental inequality, but only trying to get a polluter out of their community. This differs greatly from Stop General Iron's environmental justice framing, where their main goal was to end the reproduction of environmental inequalities not only in their area in Chicago as a whole through the restructuring of zoning laws and a community-oriented focus. This section has also shown how environmental and health concerns were the main drivers of mobilization for both of these groups. However, Lincoln Parkers also emphasize property values in their framing of the problem, which played a part in keeping these residents from complaining about any harms caused by the plant. Despite this, most residents ended up speaking up, putting their health in front of their property values. This grievance-based

framing that both communities displayed is at odds with the political process model's views on social movement formation, which establishes that problem-based grievances are not necessary for a social movement to emerge. In summary, we can see how class, racial and ethnic demographics play a part in influencing how each community framed its movements. In the next section, I will be showing how these social structures also play a role in shaping the mobilization strategies used by these communities.

MOBILIZATION STRATEGIES

In this section, I will be discussing the actual process of organizing that each community found necessary to take in order to actively oppose General Iron. Respondents involved in Stop General Iron make it clear that the only way to actively oppose this act of environmental racism by the city is to actively organize and join environmental justice groups to defend their community. On the other hand, Lincoln Parkers don't feel forced to take such radical approaches to mobilization, and instead feel like they can rely on their political connections to achieve their goals. I will subsequently be presenting the contrast between the approaches that these two groups found necessary to get their voices heard and achieve their goals. Per Bullard (1990), Southeast Side respondents agree that they don't have enough power or influence over the government to be heard, and so they had to take a more radical approach to mobilization to protect their community. Lincoln Parkers' higher socioeconomic status is leveraged to protect them due to their easier access and influence on local government. Therefore, Lincoln Parkers were able to garner governmental attention for their goals without having to resolve to more radical approaches compared to the Southeast Side. I will also be expanding on the reasons it took

General Iron so long to shut down in Lincoln Park despite years of neighborhoods complaining to their local governments, including the power and wealth amassed by the owners of General Iron, as well as Lincoln Parkers' inexperience with social movement mobilization, and naive trust in government protection.

Stop General Iron's Mobilization Strategies

I will now show how Stop General Iron's EJ framing manifested in radical mobilization strategies that led their movement to success. Firstly, I will explain the diverse methods of resistance that Stop General Iron undertook to have their voices heard, and then I will show why these methods were necessary for the success of this movement. Then, I will also reveal examples of how the organizers within this movement felt about having to take on these radical mobilization tactics.

Starting off, this was not the Southeast Side's first rodeo when it came to defending itself against environmental hazards. As an environmental justice community that has repeatedly been attacked by Chicago's historically racist and environmentally harmful zoning laws, Southeast Side residents are experienced when it comes to organizing against these hazards. Most of my interviewees have had previous environmental justice organizing experience. The fact that this community must repeatedly defend themselves against environmental hazards means that it already had strong established networks between EJ organizations and groups set up. This aligns well with Bullard (1990)'s emphasis on how marginalized, low-income communities must come together to fight environmental inequalities due to their lack of access to institutional and political resources.

Stop General Iron, therefore, emerged as a coalition of several groups in the Southeast Side who already had these strong networks established, and knew what approaches were best to take in order to achieve their goals. Since the main goal for this group was to keep General Iron out of the neighborhood, and therefore get their construction permit denied, the group started off by appealing to their local governments. They then took to the streets, engaging in various protests and forms of direct action. They did everything from protests in the community to a "die-in" protest, where they all laid down on the cold sidewalk on one of the coldest winter days in Chicago in front of Mayor Lori Lightfoot's house. However, when they realized they still weren't being heard by the Mayor and the local government, which was "unsurprising," according to Maria, they knew they had to resort to more radical strategies in order to achieve their goals.

The 30-day hunger strike was one of the most radical tactics taken by the Stop General Iron movement, with nine organizers taking on the challenge to elevate the stakes of the movement. Further, this tactic was all the more powerful because it was done in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic, raising the stakes even higher. It was finally after the hunger strike that the movement finally started gaining traction in the media and with their representatives, even making it to the national news and reaching the national EPA. Brie, one of the hunger strikers, expands on her experience:

> We started making the call that we thought that escalation would have to get to that point [the hunger strike] in maybe December [of 2021]. And so [...] we said "we've protested and we've done petitions, we've raised funds. We've done everything." The next escalation to get this like center stage on Chicago media would be a hunger strike [...] At first, it was just going to be a week long. Um, and we announced it, and then we noticed that the media coverage didn't really kick in until the end of the first week. So we [kept it

> going]. And then I think at day 15, we said, OK, we're in this for the full month now, we have to do it for the next 30 days. (Zoom Interview, February 16th 2023)

In Brie's response, we can see how the hunger strike emerged as a last-call strategy in order to be heard, and how it evolved according to the recognition they were receiving. Although this strategy was in fact successful in getting the permit denied and therefore achieving the movement's goals, its members still must ask themselves if the risks that the hunger strikers and protesters had to take with their health, especially during a pandemic, were worth the end result. This is pertinent as all interviewees agree that this won't be the last time this neighborhood will have to defend itself against issues of this nature. I will expand on this in the subsequent examples.

The sentiment that radical organizing was needed to receive attention is unanimously shared by all of the interviewees. Further, most of my interviewees felt both inspired and in despair by the attention the hunger strike received. After the hunger strike, there was an announcement about the permit being delayed so that the IEPA (Illinois Environmental Protection Agency) could conduct more tests, which was already a huge feat for the movement. The members, however, still felt desperation since they knew this wouldn't be the last time fighting an incoming polluter: "[the hunger strike] might have strengthened our movement, but also it was a little discouraging cause we're like, all right, you know, how far are we gonna take this?" (Maria, Zoom Interview, January 20th 2023). Maria then goes on to talk about how governmental organizations started getting involved, which is what changed everything for the better: "They finally denied the permit after the federal government, not even the local one, got involved," (ibid).

All of my interviewees were unanimously ecstatic at the denial of the permit while knowing that there is still much more to fight for. Going back to the framing strategies of the Stop General Iron movement, all the interviewees knew that, although this was a big win for their movement, there was still a lot left to do in terms of achieving structural change, and preventing this from happening again. Maria, for example, expands on this by telling me "we know the fight's not over and there's always something to fight for [...] it's just a never-ending battle." Here is where we see one of the biggest differences between the Southeast Side organizers and those in Lincoln Park - the end goal of structural change, and getting rid of the zoning laws that allow for these inequalities in industrial siting locations. This is put well by Lorena, who says:

> I mean I think there's a lot of implications for environmental justice of course because it shows how [...] it's possible [...] to expose the negative impacts of like racist and environmentally racist zoning practices. So I think that [...] there's lots of similar campaigns that are all around the country who may gain something from this. [...] We tried everything, petitioning, and peaceful protests weren't enough, but nobody should ever have to go on a hunger strike, especially during a pandemic, to protect their health and their community. (Zoom Interview, January 13th 2023)

In this section, I have shown how SouthEast Siders, because of their neighborhood's socioeconomic status and racial and ethnic makeup, were forced into using radical forms of mobilization in order to achieve their goal of getting the permit denied. However, their broader goal of ending environmental inequalities in Chicago is still in the works, and although residents believe that these inequalities will continue reproducing themselves until zoning laws are restructured, they still have faith in the use of direct action to achieve change.

Lincoln Park's Mobilization Strategies

In this section, I will be showing that because of Lincoln Park's high socioeconomic status and white privilege, residents were not experienced when it came to organizing against polluting industries in their area, therefore lacking the activist networks needed to organize against General Iron. What they lacked in organizing experience, however, they made up for in monetary resources and connections to those in power. This can be seen as a good thing, but also negative in the ways that power and money played a part in these residents' false trust in the political system.

In a stark contrast to the established networks of EJ coalitions that were ready to organize against General Iron in the Southeast Side, the North Side's inexperience when it comes to organizing against environmental hazards, which can be attributed to their affluence and privilege (Bullard 1990), meant that they did not have such established EJ networks to rely upon. For this reason, Lincoln Parkers had to build a movement from the ground up to get rid of the company polluting their neighborhood, which was a difficult task that landed on Lana, the founder of Clean the North Branch. Lana describes the differences she experienced in organizing in her own community, versus in the Southeast Side with Stop General Iron:

> For me, in the North side, it took a lot to explain to our community what the issues were that we were facing as a community from General Iron. It took a lot of emails to get people to show up, it took a lot of research and pushing information to them to get them to act and to get them to unite as one. Because I think that there's very few people that really understood the impact of General Iron to their health and that's because of where it's located and also the people in this neighborhood they, similar to me I was like I figured the EPA in our city and all of the processes and protocols and offices that are here to protect us were doing their job and that was not true. That was my experience and my take on the efforts that I put in play on the North side. Once I got to the Southeast Side I was just flabbergasted by how many people were ready to mobilize... The army is just massive like General Iron is just one of the many things they have had to go through to protect our Southeast Siders' way of life. (Zoom Interview, March 3rd 2023)

It is clear in this quote that Lana understands the differences between those who live in her neighborhood who have not had to deal with EJ issues before, and people in the Southeast Side for whom this is a recurring issue they must consistently fight against. Lana admits that, because living in an affluent neighborhood like Lincoln Park is supposed to guarantee a sense of safety provided by the government and the EPA, for years nobody mobilized because they had a false trust in the government that the pollution emanating from General Iron was not something to be worried about. This is a shared sentiment that I found in most of my Lincoln Park interviews. The following quote from Alice, a Lincoln Park resident, exemplifies these points about how Lincoln Park residents expect the city to be "on their side," and don't see the need to mobilize to protect themselves in the same way as Southeast Siders who feel that they are under siege and need to defend themselves:

> Usually, Lincoln Parkers don't need defending, they can get things done with money and power and stuff… but moving the facility into another residential area, especially one like the Southeast Side which doesn't have as many resources as we do here… I just can't get behind that. (Zoom Interview, March 13th 2023)

Alice attests to Lana's observations that Lincoln Parkers were unaware of the harm that General Iron was causing them, due to a blindsightedness attributed to their privilege and trust in the government to protect them, which is why it took them so long to get rid of the plant. Another reason it took them so long to get rid of General Iron is attested to by Kelly, another Lincoln Park resident, which is the fact that, although Lincoln Parkers have the means to get things done with their money and power, General Iron itself was run by an affluent family, and

was, therefore, able to stay open despite countless petitions and protests against them by paying off the fines, and donating to the aldermanic elections. Kelly states:

> You know, General Iron had obviously a history of serious issues with air quality and fires and all this stuff happening and I heard a lot of things and I don't know what's true at all but a lot of stuff about them slinging a lot of money around from the family and having a lot of political influence and stuff and I'm sure some of it is true. (Zoom Interview, March 6th 2023)

Kelly further talks about how the company had donated to the Alderman's electoral campaigns, making it even harder for residents to compete against this company in getting it shut down. Finally, what actually got the company to close was the city's plans of rezoning the North Branch industrial corridor by redeveloping this area to make room for Lincoln Yards, which is meant to get rid of industrial waste in this area and, as Kelly states, "bring in green spaces and act as an excellent corridor from the highway," (Zoom Interview, March 6th 2023).

On the note of the redevelopment happening on the North Side, the Lincoln Yards project acts as a signifier of classism and racism when it comes to environmental justice issues: while the Southeast Side industrial corridor is still at risk of new environmental hazards coming in, Lincoln Park gets the plant shut down in an effort to make the North Side a more clean and healthy environment. Going back to the NIMBYism claims made in my framings section, as soon as the plant was shut down in Lincoln Park, and residents were assured that their property prices wouldn't go down from environmental pollution due to the redevelopment of this area, most LP organizers accepted the result as a victory, without considering the impacts that the plant's relocation would have on another, more vulnerable community such as the Southeast Side:

> Yeah, they [Lincoln Parkers] just wanted them [GI] out, you know. And so and so [...] because there were agreements made with the city to have General Iron shut down and moved to the South side, they were comfortable with that being our stopping point [...] Um, so I think that most people were happy with the move but not happy that it was being reopened somewhere else. But they also didn't know how to act or what to do next to stop it. So they didn't act or do anything to stop it, really. (Lana, Zoom Interview, March 3rd 2023)

Here we can see how Lana exemplifies McGurty's (1997) NIMBYism herself, by using her experience organizing against General Iron to help the Southeast Side prevent the plant's relocation, while at the same time providing insights on how most of her Lincoln Park neighbors echo Bullard's (1990) negative views in NIMBYism. Lana points out that most Lincoln Parkers were fine with only getting rid of General Irom from their own community, without engaging in efforts to prevent it from being relocated into another residential neighborhood, especially one already overburdened by industrial pollution.

In this section, I have shown how, because of Lincoln Park's privileged position of power as one of the most affluent neighborhoods in the city of Chicago, their naive trust in the city's protections had a negative impact on their mobilization strategies, forcing Lincoln Parkers to take matters into their own hands without having experience in organizing against polluting facilities. This, combined with fears of property values decreasing and the fact that General Iron itself was run by a powerful, connected family, made it so that it took Lincoln Parkers many years to get rid of the plant. However, this movement did not have to turn to the radical organizing tactics that the Southeast Side was forced into thanks to their prioritization by Chicago's government to turn the North Branch Industrial Corridor into the first redeveloped industrial corridor in the city. This is a privilege that the Southeast Side has not been granted yet, even after years of repeatedly organizing against different environmental injustices. This shows

how much influence race and socioeconomic conditions have on mobilization strategies and movement outcomes.

CONCLUSION

The right to "live, work and play," (Novotny 2000) in environmentally safe neighborhoods without experiencing disproportionately high levels of industrial waste and pollution is a right that every person deserves to have. This is one of the many environmental justice (EJ) framing strategies used by the Stop General Iron movement in order to successfully oppose an additional facility coming into a neighborhood already overburdened by environmental waste and pollution. In this paper, I have looked into the ways two communities - the Southeast Side and Lincoln Park - in Chicago mobilized against the same opponent: General Iron, a noxious polluting facility. General Iron was set to relocate from the affluent, predominantly white neighborhood of Lincoln Park to the low-income, mostly Latinx and Black neighborhood of the Southeast Side.

Using my results to answer the broader theoretical question of how race and class affect mobilization strategies, I have found that both of these communities display vastly different methods of framing their grievances against General Iron, and therefore their mobilization strategies are manifested in different ways. While both the movements in Lincoln Park and the Southeast Side were able to successfully organize against General Iron, each neighborhood's socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic demographic makeups influenced the way that these communities were able to organize. Firstly, Lincoln Parkers engaged with NIMBY (Not-In-My-Back-Yard) sentiments in order to get General Iron shut down in their neighborhood. Although most of my Lincoln Park interviewees expressed concern about where the plant would be

relocated to, their movement ended once the plant was out of their own neighborhood. Only one of my interviewees, Lana, subsequently used her experience organizing against General Iron in order to assist the Southeast Side in defending their neighborhood against this same facility. In this way, Lana echoes McGurty's (1997) views on how NIMBYism can be a tool for less affluent communities to succeed in environmental justice organizing with the help of affluent communities' resources.

The Stop General Iron movement, on the other hand, used EJ framing strategies to mobilize against General Iron with the help of its pre-existing EJ organizational networks. These previously established networks speak to how repeatedly the Southeast Side must fight against incoming polluters. On the other hand, Lincoln Park's privileged position of power and high socioeconomic status made it so that they were inexperienced in organizing against polluting facilities, which is why it took them over twenty years to get rid of this polluter. Other reasons for why it took them this long can be attributed to their hesitation to speak up about this problem due to a fear of their property values decreasing, as well as their naive trust in the government's protection, making these residents believe that the facility's pollution was not harmful for many years.

In this paper, I have established that, although most social movement theory looks at how social movements form and mobilize within two prevailing theories, resource mobilization theory and political process theory, these two bodies of literature are limited when discussing the complexities and nuances of environmental justice movement formation and mobilization. Therefore, this study bridges both of these frameworks while also looking at influential environmental justice authors such as Robert Bullard, Robert Brulle, and David Pellow in order

to analyze the movements against General Iron. My study found that the movements against General Iron align with some aspects of the political process and resource mobilization theories. Firstly, the political process framework focuses extensively on "political opportunities," and does not consider how EJ movements may be organizing directly against non-political entities, and actually aim at breaking down the structures of political and economic systems to stop discriminatory policies from reproducing environmental inequalities in minority neighborhoods. Secondly, resource mobilization does not consider how important grievance-based mobilization and the use of previously established activist networks are to EJ movements, which played a big part in the success of Stop General Iron.

Finally, my results contribute to the literature on social movements by showing how the NIMBY (Not-In-My-Back-Yard) framings in affluent communities may bridge the two sides of the debate when it comes to the relationship between NIMBYism and the formation of environmental justice movements. On the one hand, Robert Bullard (1990) argues that NIMBYism has negative impacts on environmental justice movements in that they lead to the removal of industrial sites from affluent white neighborhoods to low-income minority neighborhoods. On the other side, McGurty (1997) states that NIMBYism in affluent communities can actually lead these communities to assist environmental justice communities in their battles against incoming industrial facilities. While most of my interviews with Lincoln Parkers echo Bullard's negative views on NIMBYism, my interview with Lana, the founder of the movement against General Iron in Lincoln Park, represents McGurty's NIMBYism.

The populations I spoke with reflect some of my study's limitations, as these were not representative of all of the voices in each neighborhood. The majority (9/14) of the interviews I

conducted were with members of the Stop General Iron coalition in the Southeast Side, leaving me with only 5 interviews with Lincoln Parkers. Although I had a larger sample of Southeast Side organizers, I failed to speak to any residents of the Southeast Side who were not a part of the Stop General Iron movement. Although I did get some insights into this population from the interviews I conducted, the chance to interview those not involved in this campaign would have provided interesting results for my study. On the other hand, I did get interviews with two Lincoln Parkers who were aware of the General Iron case but did not participate in the movement.

Finally, I believe that more research is needed to address how comparative case studies of environmental justice movements fit into the prominent social movement literature. There is also a gap in the literature when looking at how EJ movements intersect gender, class, and race, which I was not able to address. Although the battle for environmental justice in the Southeast Side of Chicago is far from over, as the zoning laws that make this neighborhood an Industrial Corridor are still in place, we may take inspiration from how their framing and mobilization efforts succeeded against General Iron, and use these results to design further studies to target broader forms of environmental inequalities. Policymakers can also learn from the Stop General Iron movement in order to normalize the use of cumulative impacts analyses and make these more accessible to cases of environmental justice so that organizers don't have to resort to radical forms of direct action to be listened to.

Bibliography

Baugh, Amanda J. 2016. *God and the Green Divide : Religious Environmentalism in Black and White*. Oakland, California University Of California Press. https://muse.jhu.edu/chapter/1881243.

Bolsen, Toby, and Risa Palm. 2022. "Chapter Five - Politicization and COVID-19 Vaccine Resistance in the U.S." Edited by Toby Bolsen and Risa Palm. ScienceDirect. Academic Press. January 1, 2022. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877117321001861?casa_token=Lm-Ss79BnUcAAAAA:a8U-5N3wMMUp-Yz60LNenRHjwXrtG2GmAYayU7G_tmnnyEkPyzKk6phW13eGdqpuqBbmJJYkxw.

Brockman, Abigail. 2019. Review of Building Power in the Movement for Black Lives: Recognizing the Impacts of Embedded Utopian Organizations Today. Edited by Marissa Combs. Chicago Journal of Sociology 5.

Bullard, Robert D.. "A New "Chicken-or-Egg" Debate: Which Came First--The Neighborhood, or the Toxic Dump?." (1994).

Bullard, Robert D. 1990. Dumping in Dixie : Race, Class and Environmental Quality. London:Routledge, 594.

Bullard, Robert D. 2005. *The Quest for Environmental Justice : Human Rights and The Politics of Pollution*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Capek, Stella M. 1993. "The 'Environmental Justice' Frame: A Conceptual Discussion and an Application." Social Problems 40 (1): 5–24. https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.1993.40.1.03x0069q.

"CITY of CHICAGO Air Quality and Health Report 2 0 2 0." n.d. https://www.chicago.gov/content/dam/city/depts/cdph/statistics_and_reports/Air_Quality_Health_doc_FINALv4.pdf.

Cock, Jacklyn. *Connecting the red, brown and green: The environmental justice movement in South Africa*. na, 2004.

Downes, Chris. 2019. "Lincoln Yards Project First to Utilize North Branch Industrial Corridor Framework." Www.burnhamnationwide.com. Accessed April 25, 2023. https://www.burnhamnationwide.com/final-review-blog/chicago-north-branch-corridor.

Durkheim, Emile. 2018. Elementary Forms of Religious Life.

Emerson, Robert M, Rachel I Fretz, and Linda L Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press.

Figueroa, Robert. 2003. Review of *Bivalent Environmental Justice and the Culture of Poverty*. *Rutgers University Journal of Law and Urban Policy* 1 (1).

Goffman, Erving. 1974. Frame Analysis, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Goodwin, Jeff and James M. Jasper. 1999. "Caught in a Winding, Snarling Vine: The Structural Bias of Political Process Theory." Sociological Forum 14(1):27-54. doi:10.1023/A:1021684610881.

Greenaction. 2018. "Environmental Justice & Environmental Racism – Greenaction for Health and Environmental Justice." Greenaction.org. 2018. http://greenaction.org/what-is-environmental-justice/.

Halpern, Lucy Wang. 2020. "The Politicization of COVID-19." AJN, American Journal of Nursing 120 (11): 19–20. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.naj.0000721912.74581.d7.

Hart, P. Sol, Sedona Chinn, and Stuart Soroka. 2020. "Politicization and Polarization in COVID-19 News Coverage." Science Communication 42 (5): 107554702095073. https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547020950735.

Hautzinger, Daniel. 2020. "The Chicago Woman Who Fought to Clean up the Southeast Side." WTTW Chicago. February 24, 2020. https://interactive.wttw.com/playlist/2020/02/24/hazel-johnson.

Jenkins, J. Craig. 1983. "Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements." Annual Review of Sociology 9 (1): 527–53. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.09.080183.002523.

"Lake View & Lincoln Park PUMA, IL | Data USA." 2020. Datausa.io. 2020. https://datausa.io/profile/geo/lake-view-lincoln-park-puma-il.

McAdam, Doug. 1982. Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McGurty, Eileen Maura. "From NIMBY to civil rights: The origins of the environmental justice movement." Environmental History 2, no. 3 (1997): 301-323.

McNeely, Jeffrey A. "Nature and COVID-19: The pandemic, the environment, and the way ahead." *Ambio* 50, no. 4 (2021): 767-781.

Mulvihill, Keith. 2020. “Environmental Justice in Chicago: It’s Been One Battle after Another.” NRDC. October 29, 2020. https://www.nrdc.org/stories/environmental-justice-chicago-its-been-one-battle-after-another.

Novotny, Patrick. 2000. *Where We Live, Work, and Play : The Environmental Justice Movement and the Struggle for a New Environmentalism*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.

Pellow, D. N., & Chan, A. L. (2003). Garbage wars: The struggle for environmental justice in chicago. Electronic Green Journal, (19) Retrieved from www.scopus.com

Pleyers, Geoffrey. 2020. “The Pandemic Is a Battlefield. Social Movements in the COVID-19 Lockdown.” Journal of Civil Society 16 (4): 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2020.1794398.

Powers, Martha, Phil Brown, Grace Poudrier, Jennifer Liss Ohayon, Alissa Cordner, Cole Alder, and Marina Goreau Atlas. 2021. “COVID-19 as Eco-Pandemic Injustice: Opportunities for Collective and Antiracist Approaches to Environmental Health.” Journal of Health.

Reidy, Dave. 2021. “The Reinvestment Movement after Redlining.” South Side Weekly. March 31, 2021. https://southsideweekly.com/the-reinvestment-movement-after-redlining/.

Shertzer, Allison, Tate Twinam, and Randall P. Walsh. 2016. “Race, Ethnicity, and Discriminatory Zoning.” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 8 (3): 217–46. https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20140430.

Shilling, Fraser M., Jonathan K. London, and Raoul S. Liévanos. 2009. “Marginalization by Collaboration: Environmental Justice as a Third Party in and beyond CALFED.” *Environmental Science & Policy* 12 (6): 694–709. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2009.03.003.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford, Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. “Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation.” *American Sociological Review* 51, no. 4 (1986): 464–81. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095581.
“10th Ward Data.” 2015. *Participatory Budgeting Project Chicago*. http://www.pbchicago.org/uploads/1/3/5/3/13535542/10th_ward_data_sheet.pdf

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES. 2016. “Health Consultation Review of Analysis of Particulate Matter and Metal Exposures in Air KCBX (AKA, ‘CHICAGO PETROLEUM COKE’ Sites).” https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/hac/pha/KCBXPetroleumCoke/KCBX_Petroleum%20Coke_HC_508.pdf.

"'We Are Asking for Equity': Chicago Residents Push Back against Legacy of Environmental Racism." n.d. NBC News. https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/residents-mostly-latino-chicago-neighborhood-push-back-against-proposed-scrap-n1255717.